



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/764,068

01/19/2001

Jeff Scott Eder

6669

53787

7590

09/11/2008

ASSET TRUST, INC.  
2020 MALTBY ROAD  
SUITE 7362  
BOTHELL, WA 98021

EXAMINER

LIVERSEDGE, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3692

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/764,068	<b>Applicant(s)</b> EDER, JEFF SCOTT	
	<b>Examiner</b> JENNIFER LIVERSEDGE	<b>Art Unit</b> 3692	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-65 and 67-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-65 and 67-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/23/2007</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment and request for reconsideration of application 09/764,068, by means of an amendment after non-final filed November 23, 2007; an Appeal Brief filed January 25, 2008; and a Supplemental Appeal Brief filed July 27, 2008.

In view of the amendment after non-final, Appeal Brief, and Supplemental Appeal Brief filed as noted above, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Kambiz Abdi/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3692

This application has been transferred and is now being handled by examiner Jennifer Liversedge, the Examiner as has signed the present Office Action below. Further inquiry and responses may be directed accordingly.

The claims as presented in the amendment after non-final will be examined for this Office Action.

The amendment contains previously presented claims: 37-39, 41-45, 47-54, 56-65, 67-69, 71 and 73-74.

The amendment contains amended claims: 36, 40, 46, 55, 70 and 72.

Claims 1-35 and 66 have been canceled.

### ***Priority***

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. The present application is a C.I.P. of both application 08/999,245 filed on December 10, 1997 and application 09/358,969 filed on July 22, 1999 (now abandoned). It is noted that independent claims 64 and 70 are drawn to the use of xml metadata standards and schema which was not disclosed in the December 10, 1997 filing and therefore the limitations are not subject to the December 10, 1997 date. Additionally, dependent claims 44, 51, 56, 57 do not qualify for the December 10, 1997 date as they include limitations related to xml schema. Claims 49 and 52 are drawn to real option discount rates which was not in the December 10, 1997 disclosure and therefore the December 10, 1997 date does not apply to claims 49 and 52.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 23, 2007 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

It is noted that in the amendment and remarks, a request was made for initialed copies of IDS's be provided to applicant. Examiner believes that each IDS previously submitted has been considered by a former examiner as indicated in the USPTO system and the most recently submitted IDS is initialed and enclosed with the present Office Action. Accordingly, Examiner believes all IDS's have been considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 38 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim contains a grammatical oversight, citing "...changes that will optimize *of* one or more...". It is believed it is intended to recite "...changes that will optimize one or more...".

Claim 49 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim contains a grammatical oversight, citing "...determining a net relative contributions...". It is believed it is intended to recite "...determining a net relative contribution...".

Claim 71 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 71 claims dependence from claim 71. For purposes of examination, it will be assumed that claim 71 is meant to depend from claim 70.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 36 recites the limitation "said net relative contributions" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed that the language is meant to refer to "said net tangible, relative contribution" from line 9.

Claims 36, 55 and 72 recite the limitation "the portion" in line 3 for claims 36 and 55 and line 4 for claim 72. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed that the language is meant to refer to "a portion".

Claim 49 recites the limitation "the difference", "the company cost", "the value", "the value difference", and "the two discount rates". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 52 recites the limitation "the previously identified indicators" and "the prior processing". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 57 recites the limitation "said data" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It would be more clear to refer to "said event data" as set forth in line 2 to maintain consistency across the data label.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 36-45, 55-65, 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claims 36, 55, 64 and 70 are directed to methods claims, however, the steps as recited do not result in a concrete, tangible and useful output. The steps, rather, speak to data manipulation and integration without a real-world output.

Claims 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because claim 72 is not tied to another statutory class. In order for a method to be considered a "process" under §101, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under §101 and is non-statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 7,249,328 B1 to Davis (further referred to as Davis).

Regarding claim 64, Davis discloses a composite application method for data processing, comprising:

Using two or more independent components of application software to produce one or more useful results (column 8, lines 23-51; column 9, lines 1-11; column 12, lines 11-56; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) by processing data where said data has been aggregated from two or more systems (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53) in accordance with a common model or schema defined by an xml metadata standard (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34;



Art Unit: 3692

column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56).

Regarding claim 65, Davis discloses where the independent components of application software can be flexibly combined as required to support the development of one or more useful results (column 8, lines 23-51; column 9, lines 1-11; column 12, lines 11-56; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 3692

Claims 36-39, 41-43 and 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “How to sort out the premium drivers of post-deal value” by Daniel W. Bielinski (further referred to as Bielinski), and further in view of “The 1986-88 stock market: investor sentiment or fundamentals?” by Baur, Quintero and Stevens (further referred to as Baur).

Regarding claim 36, Bielinski discloses a computer implemented enterprise method (pages 1-7), comprising:

Preparing transaction data related to a commercial enterprise for use in processing, analyzing said data to identify the portion of data relevant to market value, and developing a model of an enterprise market value by an element and category of value by completing a series of multivariate analyses that utilizes said identified data (pages 1-7),

Where the categories of value are selected from the group consisting of current operation, real option and combinations thereof (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 7; page 3, sections 1-6 and 9; page 4, section 3; page 6, sections 4-5),

Where the model of enterprise market value identifies a tangible contribution of each element of value to each category of value (page 1, section 1; page 2, sections 1 and 7; page 3, sections 1-9; page 4, sections 1-7; page 5, sections 1-7; page 6, sections 1-6).

Bielinski does not disclose where the elements of value are selected from the group consisting of alliances, brands, channels, customers, customer relationships,

Art Unit: 3692

employees, intellectual property, partnerships, processes, vendors and vendor relationships and combinations thereof. However, Bielinski does disclose where the elements of value are selected from alliances, employees, partnerships, processes, vendors and vendor relationships (page 3, sections 1-5; page 4, sections 4-6). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further elements of value as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Bielinski does not disclose where a category of value is market sentiment and calculating a share price for enterprise equity. However, Baur discloses where a category of value is market sentiment and calculating a share price for enterprise equity (abstract; page 2, "Stock prices and investor sentiment"; page 3, formula 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation modeling techniques as disclosed by Bielinski to adapt the use of sentiment as a value driver and to calculate stock price using sentiment as disclosed by Baur. The motivation would be that stock price is calculated based on company value and a company value is derived from real and intangible assets of value and for most accurate pricing, one would want to incorporate all assets, real and intangible.

Regarding claim 37, Bielinski does not disclose completing activities from the group consisting of the full list of activities as cited. However, Bielinski discloses completing activities from the group such as: determining an element contribution, quantifying an element impact, valuing an element, completing an analysis of enterprise

Art Unit: 3692

financial performance, optimizing one or more aspects of enterprise financial performance, simulating an enterprise financial performance, optimizing a future enterprise market value, quantifying a future enterprise market value, creating a management report valuing a real option, and combinations thereof (pages 1-5). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further completion of activities as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 38, Bielinski discloses identifying one or more value driver changes that will optimize one or more aspects of financial performance (pages 1-7). Bielinski does not disclose where the aspects of financial performance are selected from the group consisting of revenue, expense, capital change, cash flow, real option value, future market value, market sentiment value, market value and combinations thereof. However, Bielinski discloses where aspects of financial performance are selected from the group such as: revenue, expense, cash flow, real option value, future market value, market value and combinations thereof (pages 1-7). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further aspects of financial performance as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 39, Bielinski does not disclose where a series of multivariate analyses are selected from the group consisting of the full list as cited in the claim.

Art Unit: 3692

However, Bielinski discloses where a series of multivariate analyses are selected from the group such as identifying one or more previously unknown relationships between one or more value drivers, identifying one or more previously unknown relationships between one or more elements of value, quantifying one or more inter-relationships between value drivers, quantifying one or more impacts between elements of value, determining a net impact for each category of value, calculating one or more real option values, and combinations thereof (pages 1-7). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further multivariate analyses as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 41, Bielinski does not disclose wherein enterprise transaction data are obtained from systems selected from the group consisting of the full list as cited in the claim. However, Bielinski discloses wherein enterprise transaction data are obtained from systems selected from the group such as advanced financial systems, basic financial systems, process management systems, supply chain management systems, vendor management systems, operation management systems, sales management systems, human resource systems, accounts receivable systems, accounts payable systems, inventory systems, and combinations thereof (pages 1-7). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be

Art Unit: 3692

obvious to provide further enterprise transaction data as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 42, Bielinski discloses using one or more composite applications to complete the processing (page 1, section 1; page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 8-9; page 7, section 6).

Regarding claim 43, Bielinski does not disclose a combination of component and category of value models selected from the group consisting of up to three predictive component value models, a real option discount rate model, a real option valuation model, a market sentiment model by element of value and combinations thereof. Bielinski discloses a combination of component and category of value models selected from the group consisting of up to three predictive component value models, a real option valuation model, and combinations thereof (pages 1-7). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further models as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 45, Bielinski discloses identifying one or more value driver changes that will optimize a future market value portion of said enterprise market value (pages 1-7).

Claims 46-48, 53-54 and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “How to sort out the premium drivers of post-deal value” by Daniel W. Bielinski (further referred to as Bielinski), in view of “The 1986-88 stock market: investor sentiment or fundamentals?” by Baur, Quintero and Stevens (further referred to as Baur), and further in view of US Patent 4,989,141 to Lyons et al. (further referred to as Lyons).

Regarding claim 46, Bielinski discloses a program storage device readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a computer to perform an element method (pages 1-7), comprising:

analyzing data using a predictive model to identify one or more indicators of value for each element of value by a category of value (pages 1-7), where the categories of value are current operation and real option and combinations thereof (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 7; page 3, sections 1-6 and 9; page 4, section 3; page 6, sections 4-5),

determining a net tangible, relative contribution of each element of value to each category of value by analyzing an enterprise financial performance model comprised of said indicators by category and element of value (page 1, section 1; page 2, sections 1 and 7; page 3, sections 1-9; page 4, sections 1-7; page 5, sections 1-7; page 6, sections 1-6),

calculating a value for each element of value using said net relative contributions (page 1, section 1; page 2, sections 1 and 7; page 3, sections 1-9; page 4, sections 1-7; page 5, sections 1-7; page 6, sections 1-6), and

reporting the value of the elements using an electronic display or a paper document (page 1, section 1; page 3, section 10; page 4, sections 4 and 6-7).

Bielinski does not disclose where a category of value is market sentiment. However, Baur discloses where a category of value is market sentiment (abstract; page 2, "Stock prices and investor sentiment"; page 3, formula 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation modeling techniques as disclosed by Bielinski to adapt the use of sentiment as a value driver as disclosed by Baur. The motivation would be that stock price is calculated based on company value and a company value is derived from real and intangible assets of value and for most accurate pricing, one would want to incorporate all assets, real and intangible.

Neither Bielinski nor Baur disclose integrating enterprise transaction data in accordance with a common model or scheme. However, Lyons discloses integrating enterprise transaction data in accordance with a common model or scheme (column 2, lines 16-25 and lines 51-57; column 2, line 67-column 3, line 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data analysis methods of Bielinski and Baur to adapt the integrating of enterprise data in a common model of schema as disclosed by Lyons. The motivation would be that to be sure that the analytical model were incorporating the most recent and relevant data from all



Art Unit: 3692

applicable sources, and to create an efficient means by which to share that data, enabling a common scheme for data integration would be required, as disclosed by Lyons.

Regarding claim 47, Bielinski does not disclose where the elements of value are selected from the group consisting of alliances, brands, channels, customers, customer relationships, employees, intellectual property, partnerships, processes, production equipment, vendors and vendor relationships and combinations thereof. However, Bielinski does disclose where the elements of value are selected from alliances, employees, partnerships, processes, production equipment, vendors and vendor relationships (page 3, sections 1-5; page 4, sections 4-6). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further elements of value as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 48, Bielinski discloses where a net relative contribution for each of one or more elements of value to each of one or more categories of value further comprises a direct element contribution to a category of value net of any element impacts on other elements of value (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 1-4, 7; page 5, section 1; page 6, sections 5-6).

Regarding claim 53, Bielinski discloses where the calculated value for each element of value further comprises a value for a point in time within a sequential series of points in time (page 1, section 1; page 2, section 1; page 6, section 5).

Regarding claim 54, Bielinski discloses wherein the net relative contribution for each element of value to each category of value further comprises a net causal contribution (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 1-4, 7; page 5, section 1; page 6, sections 5-6).

Regarding claim 72, Bielinski discloses a computer implemented market value accounting method (pages 1-7), comprising:

Preparing a plurality of enterprise related data for use in processing, analyzing said data to identify the portion of data relevant to market value, analyzing the identified data with a series of models as required to identify a tangible contribution of each of one or more elements of value to each of one or more categories of value (pages 1-7),

Where the categories of value further comprise a current operation category of value and a real option category and combinations thereof (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 7; page 3, sections 1-6 and 9; page 4, section 3; page 6, sections 4-5),

Using the tangible contribution for each element of value to identify a market value for each element of value (page 1, section 1; page 2, sections 1 and 7; page 3, sections 1-9; page 4, sections 1-7; page 5, sections 1-7; page 6, sections 1-6), and

Reporting the value of each element of value (page 1, section 1; page 3, section 10; page 4, sections 4 and 6-7).

Bielinski does not disclose where the elements of value are customers and selected from the group consisting of alliances, brands, channels, employees, intellectual property, partnerships, processes, vendors and vendor relationships and combinations thereof. However, Bielinski does disclose where the elements of value are selected from alliances, employees, partnerships, processes, vendors and vendor relationships (page 3, sections 1-5; page 4, sections 4-6). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further elements of value as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Bielinski does not disclose where a category of value is market sentiment. However, Baur discloses where a category of value is market sentiment (abstract; page 2, "Stock prices and investor sentiment"; page 3, formula 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation modeling techniques as disclosed by Bielinski to adapt the use of sentiment as a value driver and to calculate stock price using sentiment as disclosed by Baur. The motivation would be that stock price is calculated based on company value and a company value is derived from real and intangible assets of value and for most accurate pricing, one would want to incorporate all assets, real and intangible.

Neither Bielinski nor Baur disclose reporting in a balance sheet format and where the reported value is a value for a specific point in time within a sequential series of

Art Unit: 3692

points in time. However, Lyons discloses reporting in a balance sheet format (column 2, lines 16-34; column 3, lines 1-10; column 10, lines 1-9; column 16, lines 61-68; column 24, line 50 – column 25, line 12 where it is disclosed that users input data from various reports such as balance sheets and income statements, the data can be manipulated and analyzed across departments in an organization, for example, and then a report can be generated representing data as requested by a user and wherein it would be obvious that if data is submitted in the form of a balance sheet or income statement, that data could then be output in the same format) and where the reported value is a value for a specific point in time within a sequential series of points in time (column 2, lines 61-66; column 8, lines 56-61). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data analysis of key drivers of market value as disclosed by Bielinski and Baur to adapt the use of providing reports in balance sheet format and providing values for a specific point in time across a sequential period of time as disclosed by Lyons. The motivation would be that a balance statement provides key data in understanding market value of an enterprise, and further value is analyzed and understood at certain points in time relative to a continuum of time.

Regarding claim 73, neither Bielinski nor Baur disclose including a value for a plurality of financial assets in a report with a balance sheet format. However, Lyons discloses including a value for a plurality of financial assets in a report with a balance sheet format (column 2, lines 16-34; column 3, lines 1-10; column 10, lines 1-9; column 16, lines 61-68; column 24, line 50 – column 25, line 12) where it is disclosed that users

Art Unit: 3692

input data from various reports such as balance sheets and income statements, the data can be manipulated and analyzed across departments in an organization, for example, and then a report can be generated representing data as requested by a user and wherein it would be obvious that if data is submitted in the form of a balance sheet or income statement, that data could then be output in the same format. Given the combination of Bielinski, Baur and Lyons as cited in claim 72 with regards to presenting data in a balance sheet format, it is further obvious to report multiple values in a balance sheet format as balance sheets contain various types of data.

Regarding claim 74, neither Bielinski nor Baur specifically disclose tracking a change in value of each of one or more elements of value over time, and including the calculated changes in value of each element of value in an income statement or a cash flow statement. However, Lyons discloses tracking a change in value of each of one or more elements of value over time (column 2, lines 58-66; column 8, lines 56-61), and including the calculated changes in value of each element of value in an income statement or a cash flow statement (column 2, lines 16-34; column 3, lines 1-10; column 10, lines 1-9; column 16, lines 61-68; column 24, line 50 – column 25, line 12) where it is disclosed that users input data from various reports such as balance sheets and income statements, the data can be manipulated and analyzed across departments in an organization, for example, and then a report can be generated representing data as requested by a user and wherein it would be obvious that if data is submitted in the form of a balance sheet or income statement, that data could then be output in the same

Art Unit: 3692

format. Given the combination of Bielinski, Baur and Lyons as cited in claim 72 with regards to presenting data in a balance sheet format, it is further obvious to report values over a period of time in traditional financial forms such as an income statement or cash flow statement format.

Claims 55 and 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “How to sort out the premium drivers of post-deal value” by Daniel W. Bielinski (further referred to as Bielinski), and further in view of US Patent 4,989,141 to Lyons et al. (further referred to as Lyons).

Regarding claim 55, Bielinski discloses a computer implemented future market value method (pages 1-7), comprising:

analyzing data to identify the portion of data relevant to market value, and developing a causal model of net element of value contribution to enterprise market value by category of value using the identified portion of data, and identifying one or more element of value related changes that will optimize a future market value portion of enterprise market value by analyzing said model (pages 1-7).

Bielinski does not disclose where the elements of value are selected from the group consisting of alliances, brands, channels, customers, customer relationships, employees, intellectual property, partnerships, processes, vendors and vendor relationships and combinations thereof. However, Bielinski does disclose where the elements of value are selected from alliances, employees, partnerships, processes,

Art Unit: 3692

vendors and vendor relationships (page 3, sections 1-5; page 4, sections 4-6). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further elements of value as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Bielinski does not disclose integrating enterprise transaction data in accordance with a common model or scheme. However, Lyons discloses integrating enterprise transaction data in accordance with a common model or scheme (column 2, lines 16-25 and lines 51-57; column 2, line 67-column 3, line 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data analysis methods of Bielinski to adapt the integrating of enterprise data in a common model of schema as disclosed by Lyons. The motivation would be that to be sure that the analytical model were incorporating the most recent and relevant data from all applicable sources, and to create an efficient means by which to share that data, enabling a common scheme for data integration would be required, as disclosed by Lyons.

Regarding claim 58, Bielinski discloses where a net relative contribution for each of one or more elements of value to each of one or more categories of value further comprises a direct element contribution to a category of value net of any element impacts on other elements of value within said category of value (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 1-4, 7; page 5, section 1; page 6, sections 5-6).

Art Unit: 3692

Regarding claim 59, Bielinski does not disclose a plurality of models selected from the group consisting of predictive component of value models, predictive market value models, relative element strength models, real option discount rate models, real option valuation models, market sentiment models and combinations thereof. Bielinski discloses a plurality of models selected from the group consisting of predictive component of value models, predictive market value models, relative element strength models, real option valuation models, and combinations thereof (pages 1-7). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further models as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 60, Bielinski discloses where a net contribution for each of one or more elements of value further comprises a direct contribution to a value of a category of value net of any impact on other elements of value (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 1-4, 7; page 5, section 1; page 6, sections 5-6).

Claims 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski and Lyons as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Baur.

Regarding claim 61, Bielinski discloses where one or more categories of value are selected from the group consisting of current operation, real option and



Art Unit: 3692

combinations thereof (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 7; page 3, sections 1-6 and 9; page 4, section 3; page 6, sections 4-5). Neither Bielinski nor Lyons disclose where a category of value is market sentiment. However, Baur discloses where a category of value is market sentiment (abstract; page 2, "Stock prices and investor sentiment"; page 3, formula 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation modeling techniques as disclosed by Bielinski and Lyons to adapt the use of sentiment as a value driver as disclosed by Baur. The motivation would be that stock price is calculated based on company value and a company value is derived from real and intangible assets of value and for most accurate pricing, one would want to incorporate all assets, real and intangible.

Regarding claim 62, Bielinski discloses where the future market value portion of enterprise market value comprises a summation of values selected from current operation value, real option value and combinations thereof (page 1, section 2; page 2, section 7; page 3, sections 1-6 and 9; page 4, section 3; page 6, sections 4-5). Neither Bielinski nor Lyons disclose market sentiment value. However, Baur discloses market sentiment in valuation (abstract; page 2, "Stock prices and investor sentiment"; page 3, formula 3). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation modeling techniques as disclosed by Bielinski and Lyons to adapt the use of sentiment as a value driver as disclosed by Baur. The motivation would be that stock price is calculated based on company value and a

Art Unit: 3692

company value is derived from real and intangible assets of value and for most accurate pricing, one would want to incorporate all assets, real and intangible.

Regarding claim 63, Bielinski does not disclose where the value driver changes that will optimize future market value are identified by algorithms selected from the group consisting of monte carlo algorithms, genetic algorithms, multi criteria optimization algorithms and combinations thereof. However, Bielinski discloses where the value driver changes that will optimize future market value are identified by multi criteria optimization algorithms (page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, section 7; page 5, section 1; page 6, sections 5-6). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further algorithms as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Claim 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis.

Regarding claim 67, Davis does not disclose where the independent components of application software complete processing selected from the group consisting of the full list as stated in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses where the independent components of application software complete processing selected from the group such as: analysis, attribute derivation, classification, clustering, data acquisition,

Art Unit: 3692

data conversion, data storage, data transformation, keyword match identification, and combinations thereof (column 4, lines 10-45; column 8, lines 24-46; column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 5; column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 15-56; column 13, lines 20-48; column 15, lines 60-67; column 16, lines 11-15; column 17, lines 7-12 and lines 38-67; column 18, lines 1-67; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-59; column 23, lines 64-67; column 26, lines 47-67; column 27, lines 1-21; column 28, lines 31-39; column 30, lines 51-58; column 31, lines 33-50; column 33, lines 28-47; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-65; column 45, lines 1-14; column 49, lines 19-48; column 50, lines 38-49). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further processes as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 68, Davis does not disclose where the useful results are selected from the group consisting of the full list as stated in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses where the useful results are selected from the group such as: enterprise financial performance analysis, management reporting, share price valuation, sub-element clustering and combinations thereof (column 8, lines 36-51; column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 52-62; column 12, lines 26-56; column 45, lines 1-14 and lines 40-50; column 49, lines 20-42). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly

Art Unit: 3692

within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further useful results as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Regarding claim 69, Davis does not disclose where enterprise management systems are selected from the group consisting of the full list as stated in the claim limitation. However, Davis discloses where the enterprise management systems are selected from the group such as: accounts receivable systems, accounts payable systems, advanced financial systems, basic financial systems, process management systems, operation management systems, sales management systems, capital asset systems, inventory systems, the Internet, external databases and combinations thereof (column 8, lines 24-51; column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 31-53; column 11, lines 52-62; column 12, lines 26-56; column 45, lines 1-14 and lines 40-50; column 49, lines 20-42). It is noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further systems as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, and further in view of US Patent 6,549,922 B1 to Srivastava et al. (further referred to as Srivastava).

Art Unit: 3692

Regarding claim 70, Davis discloses a computer implemented data processing method, comprising:

Integrating, converting and storing enterprise related transaction data (column 8, lines 29-34; column 10, lines 25-26; column 11, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 26-29 and lines 53-56; column 28, lines 31-34; column 38, lines 50-53) in accordance with a common xml schema (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65)

Where metadata mapping is guided by a metadata mapping table (column 10, lines 19-53; column 11, lines 24-64; column 12, lines 45-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 2-14; column 20, lines 32-38; column 21, lines 26-61; column 30, lines 51-58; column 33, lines 28-47; column 49, lines 19-47; column 50, lines 38-45);

Where some data are pre-specified for integration and conversion (column 10, lines 25-30; column 12, lines 26-56; column 15, lines 60-67; column 21, lines 46-59),

Where the common schema further comprises a network schema that is defined by an xml metadata (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and

Art Unit: 3692

lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65),

Where said integration is completed by one or more independent software components (column 8, lines 23-51; column 9, lines 1-11; column 12, lines 11-56; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56), and

Where the integrated data is stored in one or more tables in an application database (Figures 2-3 and 11; column 14, lines 4-49; column 15, lines 23-67; column 16, lines 115).

Davis does not disclose where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table. However, Srivastava discloses where a metadata and conversion rules window is used to establish a metadata mapping table (Figure 2; column 3, lines 27-62; column 5, lines 14-18; column 6, lines 15-18; column 7, lines 27-31). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of metadata mapping tables as disclosed by Davis to provide a window for establishing the tables as disclosed by Srivastava. The motivation is that GUIs use windows for providing a user interface for such functions as defining a

Art Unit: 3692

metadata table and it would be obvious to use a commonly known technique for establishing tables, namely the providing of a window, as disclosed by Srivastava.

Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis and Srivastava as applied to claim 70 above, and further in view of "Building customer and shareholder value" by A. Cleland and A. Bruno (further referred to as Cleland).

Regarding claim 71, Davis discloses where each of one or more tables in an application database further comprise one axis that is defined by one or more time periods that require data (Figure 14A-F, 15B-C, 16-17, 20A-D, 22A-B).

Neither Davis nor Srivastava disclose another axis that is defined by one or more data categories selected from the group consisting of components of value, sub-components of value, known value drivers, elements of value, non-relevant attributes and combinations thereof. However, Cleland discloses another axis that is defined by one or more data categories selected from the group such as components and elements of value and known value drivers (Exhibits 1-5 and related text). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of analysis and charting of key financial figures using metadata as disclosed by Davis and Srivastava to adopt the charting of value as disclosed by Cleland. The motivation would be that charts provide a visual representation of data which is often more meaningful than the raw data itself for drawing conclusions about the data, such as if one were reviewing data related to customer and/or stockholder value as disclosed by Cleland. It

Art Unit: 3692

is further noted that the claim is set forth as a Markush claim and as such each of the items within the set are admittedly within a group known in the art. Therefore it would be obvious to provide further processes as are known to be a part of a group in the art.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski and Baur as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Davis.

Regarding claim 44, neither Bielinski nor Baur disclose where preparing transaction data for use in processing further comprises integrating said data in accordance with a common schema where the common schema is defined by a COBRA metadata or an xml metadata. However, Davis discloses where preparing transaction data for use in processing further comprises integrating said data in accordance with a common schema where the common schema is defined by a COBRA metadata or an xml metadata (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65). It would be obvious to one of ordinary



Art Unit: 3692

skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data analysis for value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski and Baur to adapt the use of integrating data using xml metadata as disclosed by Davis. The motivation would be that to understand the overall value of an enterprise, it would be advantageous to gather data from various groups and departments and providing a common schema for doing so creates a more efficient means of sharing data, as disclosed by Davis.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski, Baur and Lyons as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of Davis.

Regarding claim 51, neither Bielinski, Baur, nor Lyons disclose where a common model or schema is defined by an xml metadata. However, Davis discloses where a common model or schema is defined by an xml metadata (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data analysis for

Art Unit: 3692

value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski, Baur and Lyons to adapt the use of integrating data using xml metadata as disclosed by Davis. The motivation would be that to understand the overall value of an enterprise, it would be advantageous to gather data from various groups and departments and providing a common schema for doing so creates a more efficient means of sharing data, as disclosed by Davis.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski and Lyons as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Davis.

Regarding claim 56, neither Bielinski nor Lyons disclose where a common model or schema is defined by an xml metadata. However, Davis discloses where a common model or schema is defined by an xml metadata (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the data analysis for value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski and Lyons to adapt the use of integrating data

Art Unit: 3692

using xml metadata as disclosed by Davis. The motivation would be that to understand the overall value of an enterprise, it would be advantageous to gather data from various groups and departments and providing a common schema for doing so creates a more efficient means of sharing data, as disclosed by Davis.

Regarding claim 57, neither Bielinski nor Lyons disclose the use of a flexible system architecture where said architecture further comprises event data that has been integrated in accordance with a common xml schema and independent components of application software that can be combined to process said data as required to produce useful results. However, Davis discloses the use of a flexible system architecture where said architecture further comprises event data that has been integrated in accordance with a common xml schema and independent components of application software that can be combined to process said data as required to produce useful results (column 8, lines 40-46 and lines 52-57; column 10, lines 31-33 and lines 52-55; column 11, lines 24-66; column 12, lines 45-56; column 13, lines 34-37; column 15, lines 60-67; column 18, lines 48-54; column 26, lines 65-67; column 27, lines 1-5; column 28, lines 31-34; column 30, lines 42-50; column 30, lines 51-60; column 33, lines 15-47; column 37, lines 5-8; column 38, lines 48-56) to support organization processing (column 8, lines 29-34 and lines 40-51; column 9, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 19-30; column 12, lines 15-17; column 13, lines 19-23; column 25, lines 53-60; column 26, lines 47-67; column 28, lines 31-40; column 36, lines 59-67; column 37, lines 5-12; column 38, lines 48-65). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Art Unit: 3692

the data analysis for value drivers as disclosed by Bielinski and Lyons to adapt the use of integrating data using xml metadata as disclosed by Davis. The motivation would be that to understand the overall value of an enterprise, it would be advantageous to gather data from various groups and departments and providing a common schema for doing so creates a more efficient means of sharing data, as disclosed by Davis.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski and Baur as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,192,354 B1 to Bigus et al. (further referred to as Bigus).

Regarding claim 40, neither Bielinski nor Baur disclose wherein a predictive model algorithm is selected from the group consisting of classification and regression tree; generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity, regression; generalized additive; redundant regression network; rough-set analysis; Bayesian; multivariate adaptive regression spline and support vector method. However, Bigus discloses wherein a selected predictive model algorithm is Bayesian (column 12, lines 40-65; column 12, lines 28-33). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the use of optimization using predictive models as disclosed by Bielinski and Baur to adapt the optimization of tasks using a Bayesian predictive algorithm as disclosed by Bigus. The motivation would be to use a well known algorithm which enables machine learning in order to improve the predictive results.

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski, Baur and Lyons as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of US Patent 5,245,696 to Stork et al. (further referred to as Stork).

Regarding claim 50, neither Bielinski, Baur nor Lyons disclose where the net element contributions are identified by learning from the data where learning from the data is supported by genetic algorithms. However, Stork discloses where learning from data is supported by genetic algorithms. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the predictive modeling for optimization as disclosed by the combination of Bielinski, Baur and Lyons to adapt the use of genetic algorithms for learning as disclosed by Stork. The motivation would be to provide a means by which the modeling would continue to make better optimizations based on data and feedback.

Claims 49 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bielinski, Baur and Lyons as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of "Get Real: using real options in security analysis" by Michael J. Mauboussin of Credit Suisse First Boston (further referred to as Mauboussin).

Regarding claim 49, neither Bielinski, Baur nor Lyons disclose where determining a net relative contribution for each of one or more elements of value to a real option category further comprises computing the difference between the real option value

Art Unit: 3692

calculated using the company cost of capital and the value calculated using a real option discount rate determined on the basis of relative element strength and assigning the value difference to the different elements of value based on their relative contribution to the difference in the two discount rates. However, Mauboussin discloses calculating the difference between real option value using current equity value and discounted cash flow analysis (page 3, section 8; page 15, sections 1-2 and 6) in order to capture the value of real options (page 4, section 1; page 13, section 5) where the difference in value when including real options is allocated to an investment potential (page 5, sections 4-6; page 15, sections 2 and 6) such that an understanding between disparities between discounted cash flows and stock prices can be understood (page 8, section 3; page 13). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation of real options as disclosed by the combination of Bielinski, Baur and Lyons to adapt the computational techniques as disclosed by Mauboussin. The motivation would be to use mathematical techniques which have been determined to best capture the value of real options as an enterprise considers their overall value and conducts stock price analysis.

Regarding claim 52, Bielsinki discloses identifying one or more value drivers for each element of value from the previously identified indicators (pages 1-7), developing one or more element impact summaries from said value drivers for market value and each component of value (page 1, sections 1-2; page 2, sections 1 and 7; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 1-4 and 7), identifying a best fit combination of element

Art Unit: 3692

impact summaries and predictive model algorithm for modeling market value and each component of value (page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 4 and 7; page 5, section 1; page 6, section 5-6), determining a relative strength for each of the elements of value change vis a vis competitors (page 2, section 1; page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 4 and 6-7), calculating a real option value, identifying a net element contribution to enterprise market value by category of value by combining the results from the prior processing (page 3, sections 7-9; page 4, sections 6-7; page 5, section 1; page 6, sections 3-6). Neither Bielinski, Baur, nor Lyons disclose calculating a real option discount rate and calculating the real option value using the discount rate. However, Mauboussin discloses calculating a real option discount rate and calculating the real option value using the discount rate (page 4, section 1; page 5, sections 4-6; page 8, section 3; page 15, sections 1-2 and 6). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the valuation of real options as disclosed by the combination of Bielinski, Baur and Lyons to adapt the computational techniques as disclosed by Mauboussin. The motivation would be to use mathematical techniques which have been determined to best capture the value of real options as an enterprise considers their overall value and conducts stock price analysis.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36-65 and 67-74 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jennifer Liversedge whose telephone number is 571-272-3167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Abdi can be reached at 571-272-6702. The fax number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jennifer Liversedge/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3692